

### REMARKS

Claims 32-33 and 36-47 are pending, with claims 32 and 36 being independent. Claims 1-31, 34-35, and 37-38 have been cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. Claims 39-47 have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

#### **Section 102 Rejections**

*Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 13-15, 32-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,069,957 (Richards).*

The rejection of claims 1-31, 34-35, and 37-38 is moot, as these claims are canceled. Claims 32 and 36 are the only remaining independent claims at issue. Claims 32 and 36 have been rejected as allegedly being anticipated under Richards, col. 12, lines 1-37 and Figs. 17-23. Richards describes decryption processes wherein unique content is decrypted by unique types of keys. For example, referring to Fig. 23, Content\_C is unlocked by keys of the "C" type (*i.e.* CAK\_C<sub>0</sub>, CCK\_C<sub>3</sub>, etc.) whereas Content\_B is unlocked by keys of the "B" type (*i.e.* CAK\_B<sub>0</sub>, CCK\_B<sub>3</sub>, etc.). *See also* Figs. 17-22.

In contrast, claim 32 recites, in pertinent part, providing multiple skeleton decryption keys for multiple encrypted documents, where a single skeleton key can be used to open multiple encrypted documents.

The cited reference does not, therefore, disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 32. Claim 36 is directed to a program product, but otherwise incorporates similar limitations as claim 32. Accordingly, the applicant submits that independent claims 32 and 36, and all corresponding dependent claims, are in condition for allowance. The applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for at least this reason.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

*Claims 8-12, 23-26 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Richards in view of Stallings, Cryptography and Network Security, Chapter 6 "Public Key Cryptography," Chapter 11 "Authentication Applications" and Chapter 12.1 "Pretty Good Privacy."*

The rejection of claims 8-12, 23-26 and 35 is moot as these claims have been cancelled.

*Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Richards in view of Stallings, and further in view of Peinado et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,772,340.*

The rejection of claim 16 is moot as this claim has been canceled.

*Claims 17-22, 27-31 and 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.*

Claims 17-22, 27-31 and 38 have also been cancelled. These rejections are therefore moot, and the applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

### Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

The Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*21 May 2007*



Daniel J. Burns  
Reg. No. 52,00

**Customer No. 21876**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071